

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Confirmation No.: 5515

Appl. No. : 10/823,847
Entitled: : INDUCTION MOTOR DESIGN HAVING THE ROTOR
LOCATED WITHIN A SHELL
Applicant : Yue-Chung Chen
Filed : April 14, 2004
Art Unit : 2834
Examiner : Nguyen, Hahn N

Docket No.: : CHEN-74813
Customer No. : 24201

SUPPLEMENTAL COMMUNICATION IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FROM
RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

On July 30, 2007, Applicant petitioned the Director to review and reverse the restriction requirement that was made final in this case. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 1.144; *see also* MPEP 821.01 and 1002.02(c).

Applicant wishes to inform the Director that in the remarks for the Amendment electronically filed on September 10, 2007, Applicant requested reconsideration of the restriction requirement as follows:

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the finality of the restriction requirement between Groups I, II and III. In the Office action, the Examiner

asserted that the Group I claims merely recited “a shell” while the Group II claims recited “a shell forming a closed space,” such that the respective fields of search would be different. The Examiner further asserted that the step of “forming the shell around the rotor” in the method claims of Group III could be used to make a different product such as “a torque tube for superconductor motor.”

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims recite that the rotor is located within a shell, such that their respective fields of search for these “shell” claims would overlap. For example:

- Group I (claim 3) recites that “the rotor is located within the shell.”
- Group II (claim 8) also recites that “the rotor is located within the shell.”
- Group III (claim 14) recites the step of “forming a shell around the rotor.”

Applicant respectfully requests that the restriction requirement be withdrawn, and that claims 7 through 19 be allowed as well.

Should the Examiner withdraw the restriction requirements as a result of Applicant’s comments, the present petition to review the restriction requirement would be moot.

Applicant respectfully submits that no fees are required in connection with this petition. Nonetheless, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required by this paper to Deposit Account No. 06-2425.

If any question arises, kindly telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LLP

By: /james juo/
James Juo
Registration No. 36,177

Howard Hughes Center
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Telephone: (310) 824-5555
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696
Customer No. 24201